UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,103	03/11/2004	Takahiro Saito	Q79127	4570
23373 7 SUGHRUE MIC	7590 12/28/200 ON PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			GANEY, STEVEN J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3752	
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	· MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		12/28/2006	PAPER .	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<u>-</u>		TA 11	T			
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/797,103	SAITO ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Steven J. Ganey	3752			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication approximation or Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutely received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tilt d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13	November 2006				
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)						
/—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>4,5,7 and 8</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
	Claim(s) <u>10</u> is/are allowed.					
	Claim(s) <u>1-3,6,9 and 11</u> is/are rejected.					
7)						
, 						
	on Papers					
_	•	oor				
	9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
المعارف	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on <u>28 June 2006</u> is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
			Action of format 10-132.			
	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		•			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
		•				
		•				
Attachmen	t(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2)						
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	atom, application			

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. Receipt is acknowledged of the amendment filed on November 13, 2006, which has been fully considered in this action.
- 2. Applicant's arguments, see pages 11-15, filed November 13, 2006, with respect to the rejections of claims 1-3, 9 and 11 under 35 USC 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new grounds of rejection is made in view of Kitamura et al and JP359128968A under 35 USC 103(a).

Election/Restrictions

- 3. Claims 4, 5, 7 and 8 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on November 19, 2004.
- 4. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-3 and 6 in the reply filed on November 19, 2004 is acknowledged.

Drawings

5. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. However, the drawing filed June 28, 2006 is showing new matter since it is attempting to show the limitation added under the amendment filed March 29, 2005. The drawing is not approved.

Art Unit: 3752

Claim Objections

6. Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 2, the word "seal" should be --seat--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 8. Claims 1-3, 6, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In claims 1, 6 and 9, the language, "the flat bottom face being positioned within the inlet when the valve body is in the a closed position", is considered new matter. The specification is silent to such an arrangement and the drawings as originally filed do not show such a limitation. Applicant's arguments submitted on March 29, 2005 point to paragraph [0032], however, there is no discussion of the flat bottom face being positioned within the inlet.

Application/Control Number: 10/797,103

Art Unit: 3752

Page 4

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-3, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitamura et al in view of JP359128968A to Ono.

Kitamura et al shows a fuel injection valve comprising all the feature elements of the instant invention, except for the ball portion having a flat bottom face. JP359128968A shows a valve body comprising a ball portion with a flat bottom face. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the ball portion of Kitamura et al with a flat face, as taught by JP359128968A, since applicant has not disclosed that the flat bottom surface solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that invention would perform equally as well with a rounded bottom face or flat bottom face.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claim 10 is allowed.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Roger et al, Rush et al and Tani et al show valve bodies with ball portions and curved end surfaces having a flat bottom face.

Application/Control Number: 10/797,103

Art Unit: 3752

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven J. Ganey whose telephone number is 571-272-4899. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00-5:00; M. Tu. W and Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on 571-272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

sjg 12/22/06

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 5

12/22/06